

it, to the ordinary supervision of the district surveyor.

The thickness of the party-wall is not to be reduced under the above provisions unless the building on each side thereof be furnished with a cross-wall in manner aforesaid; or unless one of such buildings be so furnished with a cross-wall, and the other be of a lower rate.

Alterations in Schedule (D.) Part II., under the head of 'Construction and Materials.'—Timber laid continuously into an external wall at a level below the plate under the roof, must not be of greater width than one-third of the thickness of the wall, nor of greater thickness than two courses of brickwork, and it must have at least four inches of brick or stone work on each of its sides.

No timber whatever, except templates and wood-bricks, may be laid into an external wall so as to be flush with the inside face of the wall; and with reference to templates and wood-bricks, two such pieces of timber may not be laid within 13 inches of each other in the direction of the length of the wall; and no template shall exceed 3 feet in length. [This will lead to such bad building.]

New Rules in Schedule (D.) Part II., under the head of 'Openings.'—If a building be situate within 16 feet of another building, not in the same occupation, the external wall of which last-mentioned building shall have any openings on the side towards the first-mentioned building, then no opening may be made in the opposite wall of the first-mentioned building. (?)

If a building be situate within 16 feet of another building in the same occupation, and such buildings afterwards cease to be in the same occupation, the openings (if any) hereafter made in the external wall of the first-mentioned building, on the side towards the other building, must be immediately built up; except where there are no openings in the opposite wall of such other building, or such openings (if any) are built up.

If an external wall of a building be less than 4 feet distant from ground not in the same occupation, no opening may be made therein.

If an external wall of a building be less than 8 feet distant [or, if the building be of the dwelling-house class, and do not exceed two stories in height, then less than 6 feet distant] from ground not in the same occupation, no openings may be made in such wall above the height of 9 feet from the level of the lowest floor; and when an opening is made below that height, a wall must be erected opposite thereto at least as high as the top of the opening, and at least 18 inches wider on each side.

*Alteration of Schedule (D.), Part I.—*Except in cases of rebuilding, no building shall be hereafter built extending wholly or in part over a public way; and in cases of rebuilding, the building shall not be built so as to extend over a public way to a greater extent than the former building extended over such way.

Alteration in Schedule (H.), under the head of 'Cesspools and Privies.'—The sides of all cesspools and privies should be so constructed as effectually to prevent the escape of the contents thereof otherwise than by the drain into a sewer.

Alterations in Schedule (K.); Rules to be substituted for the Rules under the head of 'Back yards.'—Every building of the dwelling-house class, or the public building class, hereafter built or rebuilt, must have an enclosed back-yard or uncovered space in the same occupation as the building, and open from the level of Six Inches below the lower-

most floor upwards, unless all the rooms of such building can be and are intended to be lighted and ventilated immediately from the street or open space in front of the building; and such back-yard or uncovered space must be, at least, of the following area:—Three-fourths of a square, if the building be of the fourth rate, and do not contain more than two stories; and one square, if the building be of a higher rate, or contain more than two stories.

We have left ourselves no room for further comment.

ROYAL INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

The president, Earl de Grey, took the chair on Monday evening last, for the purpose of presenting the medals to the authors of the successful essays. Mr. Hadfield was elected a fellow. Other business having been disposed of, the president called Mr. J. W. Papworth, and said, "I have much pleasure in attending here to-day, to shew the opinion entertained of your essay, by presenting to you the medal of the Institute. I believe I did so on a former occasion, and I am glad to find that you were not satisfied with one success. Your father, who has now retired from the profession, was an early member of the Institute, and esteemed by us all. Personally I regret his retirement, because I think a trustworthy man, who has been long in the profession, still pursuing his vocation energetically, offers a valuable example to the younger members of it. I have great pleasure in handing you this medal, and hope you will persevere in a good course."

The president then addressed Mr. James Bell, and presented to him the medal of merit, with a suggestion that having mastered A., he should now try for B., and so on through life. The decision of the council, in respect of the royal medal, having been read, his lordship said it had been thought, that if the royal medal were appropriated in one year to one particular object, it would be wrong to change it, and might not be approved of by her Majesty. He himself felt quite sure that the Queen would not be particular in regard of its appropriation: her Majesty's object was simply to mark her sense of the importance of architecture, and was anxious the medal should be considered an object of ambition by all classes of members. To make sure, however, an audience was asked, and immediately granted by Prince Albert. The Prince at once assented to the mode of appropriation suggested by the council, and said he approved it highly, observing, "I think you would do better not to fix it to any one object." The president said he thought it his duty to mention this, and he trusted every member would consider the royal medal legitimately within his reach.

Professor Willis then delivered a lecture on the history and progressive alterations of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, at Jerusalem, being, by the way, an amplification of a paper on the same subject, read by him at the Royal Institution last year, and reported by us at the time. The lecturer said the investigation had occupied him many years; it was not a matter that could at once be followed out in the end. He need scarcely say this building excited great interest during the middle ages. Apart from the possibility of its site being that of the crucifixion, which many believed, he himself for one, and with which he need not trouble them, it was very interesting in an architectural point of view. It was curious to see how the architects of Constantine set about to decorate a spot considered as holy. The tomb became the centre of all pilgrimages, and of course the building there was extensively imitated elsewhere. His main reason for bringing it before such a meeting as was then assembled, was this,—that he thought much might yet be discovered as to the original church by investigation; and as some there knew the spot, and others would probably go to it, he was in hopes that what he threw out might lead them to examine it closely. Research was difficult there, indeed almost impossible; but fortunate opportunities might, perhaps, offer themselves.

The history of the church in brief was this:—Constantine raised structures to preserve the memory of three spots,—the birth-place of the Saviour, the scene of its resurrection, and that of the ascension. The second, or church in question, remained till the invasion of the Persians in 614, when it was destroyed. It was re-erected by Modestus, soon after, but was much injured, though not destroyed, in 637, by the Mohammedans. The crusaders made considerable additions to it, and so it continued till 1602, when it was burnt down, and afterwards rebuilt in such a manner as to disguise its real character.

The problem was, to discover what Constantine's architects did; and to obtain knowledge of this it was necessary to go to documentary evidence. The writings of the pilgrims, one as early as 333, were of the utmost importance, and had been carefully examined by him. A minute plan of the present church, made by Mr. Scoles, he had found of great service. First describing the church as left by the crusaders, he said he considered the tomb not to be a built structure, as often supposed, but a genuine rock sepulchre, pared down and decorated externally; and he showed the probability of this, by tracing the line of portions of the rock yet remaining at the west end of the circular building. About this the round church was built in the late Greek style, like the church of St. Sophia, and others. The appendage towards the east, added by the crusaders, was Romanesque, resembling many early buildings in Europe, and similar to those we call Norman. It had a semi-circular apse at the east end, with an aisle round it, and radiating chapels.

The original building, according to the professor's views, we described in our former notice as consisting of an enclosure of columns, with an apsidal termination towards the west (supporting the foundation for half the circular building, afterwards erected), having at the opposite extremity a basilica, similar in plan to those of St. Peter and St. Paul. To learn what the crusaders added and altered, it was only necessary to look to William of Tyre, who is very clear, and shows how the round church and court towards the east, with other sacred spots, such as the site where the wood of the cross was discovered, were converted by them into a medieval church of their own fashion. In doing this they exhibited much cleverness. It should be remembered, he said, that the Knights Hospitallers had the custody of the sepulchre, not the Templars; the latter had charge of the site of Solomon's Temple.

For an account of the church raised by Constantine, he of course went to Eusebius, and gave a translation of some passages to that author, who was more an economist than an architectural critic, and must, therefore, be listened to sceptically. When Constantine proposed to commence a house of prayer on this site, he found there a Temple of Venus; and on pulling this down, discovered the cave. Eusebius says, that the walls of the basilica were coated with marbles, the roof covered with lead, and the inner ceiling gilded. He describes a propyleum in the east; and the lecturer said a Roman gate had recently been discovered there, which he had little doubt was the very propyleum so referred to. In this basilica the apse was at the west end,—it was not till afterwards that the altar was placed at the east end of sacred buildings. The cave then stood in the open air, surrounded by porticoes, as we have already said; and a passage in a sermon by St. Cyril, preached in this church, bears out this opinion. The professor concluded by soliciting information from any who might visit the spot.

CURIOUS PROJECT FOR RETAINING SMITH-FIELD MARKET.—A scheme is now on foot for excavating beneath the whole area of Smithfield market, in order to form *abattoirs*. The plans are nearly completed, and we understand will shortly have to be brought before Parliament. A depth of not less than 25 feet is talked of, as capable of being applied to the purpose of slaughter-houses, and without any want of sufficient drainage or light. The cattle being driven into market during the night, will be slaughtered on the spot, and thus the projectors think obviate the main objection to the present locality. Mr. Andrew Moseley is the architect employed.